REMARKS

Claims 38, 40, 42-45 and 48-50 have been amended.

The Examiner has rejected applicants' claims 38 and 40-50 under 35 U.S. C. §103(a) as being unpatentable based on the Sasaki, et al. patent taken with the Nagasaki, et al. patent. With respect to applicants' claims, as amended, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants' independent claims 38 and 45 have been amended to better define applicants' invention. These claims now recite that the producing means produces correction data on the basis of the image signal reproduced by the reproducing means. Correction of the image signal reproduced by the reproducing means is then carried out based on the produced correction data. Such a construction is not taught or suggested by the Sasaki, et al. and Nagasaki, et al. patents.

The Sasaki, et al. patent discloses storing in a memory correction data such as data of white balance (WB) together with an image signal at the time of photographing. The Sasaki, et al. patent also teaches reproducing the correction data together with the image signal from the memory at the time of reproduction, and controlling the white balance of the image signal on the basis of the reproduced correction data.

However, as acknowledged by the Examiner, the Sasaki, et al. patent fails to teach or suggest generating the correction data on the basis of the image signal reproduced from the memory. The

Nagasaki, et al. patent also fails to teach or suggest generating correction data from a reproduced image signal.

The Examiner has argued that in the Nagasaki, et al. patent, an image signal read out from a memory card is subject to Y/C separation, filtering and the like. However, such separation and filtering is not correction data for correcting the image signal. Therefore, as above-stated, the Nagasaki, et al. patent also fails to teach or suggest generating correction data on the basis of the reproduced image signal.

Accordingly, the combined teachings of the Sasaki, et al. and Nagasaki, et al. patents do not teach or suggest generating correction data from a reproduced image signal and using this data to correct the reproduced image signal, as is required by applicants' amended independent claims 38 and 45, and their respective dependent claims. Such claims thus patentably distinguish over the cited patents.

In view of the above, it is submitted that applicants' amended claims patentably distinguish over the cited art of record. Accordingly, reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

John J. Torrente

ROBIN, BLECKER & DALEY
330 Madison Avenue
New York, New York 10017
(212) 682-9640

John J. Torrente
Reg. No. 26,359
An Attorney of Record